REMARKS

A terminal disclaimer is enclosed to overcome the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Amendments have been made to claim 114, the independent claim, to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 101. The claim now expresses the invention in clear, concrete method steps that produce a useful result.

Some additional dependent claims have been added. All amendments to existing claims, and all new dependent claims, are fully supported by the application as filed. No new matter has been added.

The examiner has rejected the independent claim (114) as obvious in view of Abela combined with Bhogal. The examiner is urged to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

The invention is directed to a method by which multiple clients browse content on a network and preserve access to content that is no longer on the network. The clients retrieve content data items stored at network storage locations, accessing the content data items via a proxy server. A proxy repository different from the network storage locations is provided and and connected to the proxy server. Testing for whether a content data item is already stored in the proxy repository is done by comparing a "digital fingerprint" of the content data item to the digital fingerprints of content data items already in storage in the proxy repository. The digital fingerprint is determined from the bits of a content data item. The invention ensures that a stored data item identical to the content data item exists in the proxy repository by storing the content data item in the proxy repository if comparing establishes that a data item identical to the content data item is not already stored in the proxy repository, and not storing the content data item in the proxy repository if comparing establishes that a data item identical to the content data item is already stored in the proxy repository. The stored data item is associated with an access authorization credential uniquely associated with one of the multiple clients or a person associated with the client. An expiration time is assigned to the stored data item, before which time both modification and deletion are prohibited, whereby the stored data item is preserved and

can be retrieved using the access authorization credential even after the content data item is no longer present at the one of the network storage locations.

Neither of the examiner's references comes even close to suggesting the invention. Abela deals with an electronic representation of a human fingerprint. The examiner is viewing such a representation as the "digital fingerprint" called for in the claim. That is not a reasonable interpretation, as the application makes clear that the digital fingerprint is produced from the content of the data item, and has nothing to do with a human fingerprint. The amendment made herein makes this distinction even clearer, as it calls for the digital fingerprint to be determined from the bits of a content data item. However one interprets the teaching of Abela, it is not possible to conclude that Abela teaches determining a digital fingerprint from the bits of a content data item.

Abela also fails to teach other elements of the claim. For example, associating the stored data item with an access authorization credential uniquely associated with one of the multiple clients is not taught by Abela's use of a universal identifier, as the universal identifier does not provide the unique association with a particular client.

Bhogal adds nothing that would bring a person of ordinary skill any closer to the invention. For example, it teaches nothing of any relevance to a digital fingerprint determined from the bits of a content data item.

Accordingly, claim 114 is allowable over the art of record.

The remaining claims are all properly dependent on claim 114, and thus allowable therewith. Each of the dependent claims adds one or more further limitations that enhance patentability, but those limitations are not presently relied upon. For that reason, and not because applicants agree with the examiner, no rebuttal is offered to the examiner's reasons for rejecting the dependent claims.

Allowance of the application is requested.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/18/2007

/grogerlee/
G. Roger Lee
Reg. No. 28,963

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

11656004010reply.doc